

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

Varsity Gold, Inc.,

Plaintiff,

V.

ERIC BIGHAM, individually; and ELMER BIGHAM, individually and on behalf of his marital community, collectively dba Next Level Fundraising,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C06-0509RSM

ORDER ON DEFENDANTS' THIRD
MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE
ORDER

This matter is before the Court for consideration of defendants' third motion for a protective order. Dkt. # 102. This motion arises from the Court's October 12, 2006 Order on plaintiff's motion to compel, stating that "defendants shall respond in full, **and without objections other than those already stated**, to plaintiff's interrogatories and requests for production." Dkt. # 50, p. 4 (emphasis added). This is the fourth time that defendants have challenged the effect of that language upon their assertion of attorney-client privilege with respect to documents. Dkt. # 51, 61, 62. However, this is the first time the Court has had an opportunity to reach the merits of the motion; previous orders were based on procedural considerations or constrained by the local rules.

The Court has reviewed the documents requested by plaintiffs, and withheld (or redacted) by defendants, *in camera*. The documents are copies of e-mails between counsel and client, and consist

ORDER ON MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER - 1

1 mostly of discussion of litigation strategy and the relative merits of the parties' positions. The Court finds
2 little if anything in these e-mails that is relevant to plaintiff's claims in this case. To any extent that
3 certain material may be relevant, such as a discussion of defendants' customer lists, it is obtainable by
4 other means. Further, any limited probative value of the information in the e-mails is greatly outweighed
5 by the prejudice to defendants of disclosing their litigation strategy and their view of the strength of their
6 case.

7 Accordingly, defendants' third motion for a protective order is GRANTED. Defendants need not
8 respond further to plaintiffs's discovery request by disclosing unredacted copies of the documents
9 presented to chambers for *in camera* review.

10 Dated this 23rd day of May, 2007.

11
12 
13 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ORDER ON MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE
ORDER - 2